

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NATIONAL TPS ALLIANCE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KRISTI NOEM, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-01766-EMC (SK)

**ORDER REGARDING DOCUMENT
CLAWBACK DISPUTE**

Regarding Docket No. 255

Before the Court is a discovery dispute regarding the inadvertent production of NTPSA_003990. (Dkt. No. 255.) It appears that this document was originally categorized as both attorney-client privileged and subject to the work product protection, but Defendants only argue the attorney-client privilege in their letter brief. (*Id.*) The parties have agreed that the document could be partially redacted but disagree as to which parts of the document should be redacted. (*Id.*) The Court agrees with the parties that this document includes some material which is properly subject to the attorney-client privilege, but that this material could easily be redacted. Regarding the email sent Wednesday, January 29, 2025, the Court construes the first four bullet points as requests for legal advice which should be redacted to protect attorney-client communications. The remainder of the document pertains to logistical coordination and should be produced. It is **HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiffs may use the document so redacted in their Reply Brief due July 18, 2025. Otherwise, Plaintiffs must delete all copies of the full, unredacted document immediately.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 17, 2025



SALLIE KIM
United States Magistrate Judge